

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated June 18, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claim 11 is hereby amended. Claims 1–20 are pending. Claims 1-5 and 11-15 are currently examined. Claims 6-10 and 16-20 are withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration. The Examiner states that the limitation “the first angle” in claim 11 does not have antecedent basis. Without admitting to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant herein amends claim 11 to more clearly set forth the claimed subject matter and to advance prosecution. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 and claims 12-15, which depend therefrom.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Applicant Admitted Related Art (hereinafter “AARA”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over AARA in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a plurality of pads, *each* extending at an angle from an edge of the substrate” and “a plurality of corresponding pad lines, *each* extending at *the same angle* as the angle of the *corresponding* pad.” AARA does not teach at least these features of the claimed invention. The Office alleges two pad lines 58 in the middle portion in Fig. 1 extend at the same angle as pads 59. However, Fig. 1 shows multiple pad lines 58 at the top and bottom portions of Fig. 1. As shown, these “pad lines” do not extend “at the same angle as the angle of the corresponding pad.” That is, all the pads 59 extend at a 90 degree angle from edge 56 while only two pad lines 58 extend at the same angle as their corresponding pads 59. See paragraphs [0007] and [0008] and Fig. 1. Claim 1 requires “*each*” of the “pad lines” extend “at *the same angle* as

the angle of the *corresponding* pad.” See Fig. 3. Thus, *AARA* does not teach the features of independent claim 1.

Independent claim 11 is allowable over *AARA* in that claim 11 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a plurality of pads extending at a first acute angle from an edge of the substrate.” *AARA* does not teach at least these features of the claimed invention. The Office admits that pads 59 extend at a 90 degree angle from an edge of the substrate. See, also, Fig. 1. Thus, *AARA* does not teach the features of independent claim 11. Accordingly, because *AARA* does not teach the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, claim 2-5, which depend therefrom, claim 11, and claims 12-15, which depend therefrom, are allowable over *AARA*.

In the Office Action, claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *AARA* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,951,304 to Wildes et al. (hereinafter “*Wildes*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration.

Independent claim 11 is allowable over *AARA* in view of *Wildes* in that claim 11 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a plurality of pads extending at *a first acute angle* from an edge of the substrate” and “a plurality of pad lines extending at *the first acute angle*.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. The Office admits *AARA* fails to disclose pad lines extending in an “acute angle.” Furthermore, *AARA* fails to disclose “pad lines extending at *the first acute angle*.”

Applicant respectfully submits *Wildes* fails to cure the deficiencies of *AARA*. The Office alleges *Wildes* discloses a fanout array of pads in Fig. 5. However, as shown in Fig. 6, *Wildes* discloses lines 86 and 88 extending from pads 82 and 84, respectively. See column 4, lines 56-64 and Fig. 6. These lines only extend at 90 degree angles from the edge of the substrate. That is, none of the lines 86 or 88 extend at the same acute angles as the pads 82 or 84. Thus, none of *AARA* or *Wildes* disclose “pads extending at *a first acute angle*” and “pad lines extending at *the first acute angle*,” as recited in independent claim 11. Accordingly, because the cited references fail to teach the features of the claimed invention, Applicant

respectfully submits that claim 11, and claims 12-15, which depend therefrom, are allowable over *AARA* in view of *Wildes*.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: September 18, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



By

Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicants